



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,628	10/01/2001	Chin-Yang Chen	NAUP0384USA	2279

27765 7590 07/03/2002

NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WEISS, HOWARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2814	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/682,628	CHEN, CHIN-YANG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Howard Weiss	2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Attorney's Docket Number: NAUP0384USA

Filing Date: 10/1/01

Continuing Data: none

Claimed Foreign Priority Date: none

Applicant(s): Chen

Examiner: Howard Weiss

Claim Objections

1. The Markush groupings in Claims 6 and 16 should be put in the proper phrasing, "...selected from the group consisting of..." See MPEP §2173.05(h).

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On Page 6 Paragraph 21 Line 7, "figfig." should be changed to ---fig.---. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 / 103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Initially, and with respect to Claims 10 and 20, note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See *In re Thorpe et al.*

al., 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985) and the related case law cited therein which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. As stated in Thorpe,

even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972); *In re Pilkington*, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969); *Buono v. Yankee Maid Dress Corp.*, 77 F.2d 274, 279, 26 USPQ 57, 61 (2d. Cir. 1935).

Note that Applicant has burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear.

6. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 to 12, 15, 16 and 18 to 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over McCollum et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,373,169).

McCollum et al. show all aspects of the instant invention (e.g. Figure 3c) including:

- a doped amorphous silicon conductive layer **18** set on an isolation layer **20** of a semiconductor wafer **12** and protruding from the surface of the isolation layer
- a dielectric layer made of a bottom oxide layer **24c**, a silicon nitride layer **24b** and a top oxide layer **24a**.
- a metal conductive layer **30** set on the surface of the isolation layer and covering the surface of the dielectric layer

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103(a), how the dielectric if fabricated pertains to intermediate process steps and does not affect the final device structure. See MPEP § 2113 which discusses the handling of "product by process" claims and recommends the alternative (§ 102 / § 103) grounds of rejection.

7. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCollum et al. and Go et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,016).

McCollum et al. show most aspects of the instant invention (Paragraph 6) except for the SOI substrate. Go et al. teach (e.g. Figure 14) is common and, therefore obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art to form anti-fuse structures **210** on SOI substrates **12, 14**.

8. Claims 4, 7, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCollum et al. and Cutter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,410).

McCollum et al. show most aspects of the instant invention (Paragraph 6) except for the silicon conductive layer made of doped polysilicon and the surface of the silicon conductive layer having HSG structures. Cutter et al. teach (e.g. Figure 3) to use polysilicon layer having HSG structures **22** in anti-fuse **40** to increase programming speed (Column 3 Lines 48 to 59). Although not explicitly stated, it would be obvious to doped the polysilicon layer to further increase the conductivity and the speed of the programming. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use doped polysilicon layer having HSG structures as taught by Cutter et al. in the anti-fuse of McCollum et al. to increase programming speed.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hawley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,109) teaches a protruding anti-fuse.
10. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2814 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2814 via the Art Unit 2814 Fax Center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 3C23. The faxing of such papers must

conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center number is **(703) 308-7722 or -7724**. The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2814 applications. The official TC2800 Before-Final, **(703) 872-9318**, and After-Final, **(703) 872-9319**, Fax numbers will provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt of their fax by the USPTO.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Howard Weiss at **(703) 308-4840** and between the hours of 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday or by e-mail via **Howard.Weiss@uspto.gov**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2800 Receptionist at **(703) 308-0956**.

12. The following list is the Examiner's field of search for the present Office Action:

Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class / Subclass(es): 257/ 530	6/28/02
Other Documentation: PLUS Analysis Report	6/26/02
Electronic Database(s): EAST	6/28/02

HW/hw
1 July 2002



Howard Weiss
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2814